

APPENDIX I
(PART OF THE DRAFT *2005-06 CONSOLIDATED GRANTS PROGRAM* GUIDELINES.)

***FULL PROPOSAL SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS
AND EVALUATION CRITERIA***

Appendix I-1 Full Proposal Submittal Requirements

Appendix I-2 Full Proposal Evaluation Criteria

**THESE DRAFT GUIDELINES ARE AVAILABLE FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
AND ALSO UNDER MANAGEMENT AND LEGAL REVIEW.**

Comments must be received by 5:00 PM on Monday, December 5, 2005.
We prefer to receive comments via e-mail at: DFA_Grants@waterboards.ca.gov.

Comments may also be mailed to:
State Water Resources Control Board
Division of Financial Assistance
Attn: Erin Ragazzi (CG)
1001 I Street, 16th Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814

Public Workshops for the draft Guidelines will be held as follows:

- November 30, 2005 (San Diego)
- December 1, 2005 (Sacramento)

This page intentionally left blank.

APPENDIX I-1

FULL PROPOSAL SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

Applicants will be asked to organize their Full Proposal in a format that will be consistent with the evaluation criteria. This approach should assist applicants in providing complete documentation and will streamline the review process. Full proposal will be submitted online using State Water Resources Control Board's (State Water Board's) Financial Assistance Application Submittal Tool (FAAST). **Applicants should be sure to use consistent terminology throughout their Full Proposal.**

The following information will be requested as part of the Full Proposal submittal:

I. Eligibility Information: This information will be requested in a question and answer format in FAAST. This format will allow the reviewers to verify the continued eligibility of the Full Proposal for the applicable funding source.

II. Full Proposal General Documentation: This documentation will be requested as an attachment in FAAST. This part of the application documents scope of work, schedule, budget, stakeholder involvement, and disadvantaged communities information. The information requested as part of this attachment will be applicable to all Proposals, regardless of the funding source for which the application will be evaluated.

III. Integrated Watershed Management Planning (IWMP) Proposals Supplemental Documentation: This documentation will be requested as an attachment in FAAST for proposals that have been submitted for the IWMP planning funds. This part of the application provides documentation of impacts and benefits, relation to local planning and agency coordination, watershed management strategies and integration, plan implementation, and data management.

IV. Implementation Projects Supplemental Documentation: This documentation will be requested as an attachment in FAAST for all proposals except the IWMP planning funds. This part of the application provides documentation of benefits and impacts, technical and scientific merit, monitoring and data collection, and project performance and assessment.

V. Program-Specific Information: This documentation will be requested as an attachment in FAAST. The information will be program-specific and will document information not provided in other sections of the application that are an important part of the Proposal evaluation.

VI. Additional Application Information: This information will be requested in a question and answer format in FAAST. The information will be important for the Selection Panels to have available when making funding recommendations.

More details on the minimum information that must be provided in the Full Proposal for each of the sections are discussed in the corresponding sections below.

APPENDIX I-1

I. ELIGIBILITY

The eligibility information will be requested in a question and answer format in FFAST. **Incomplete or ineligible applications will not be reviewed.**

i. GENERAL ELIGIBILITY

Provide information to demonstrate completeness, applicant and project eligibility, and consistency with the Concept Proposal (CP).

A. Eligibility Information

All proposals must meet the Eligibility Requirements outlined in Section III of the Guidelines. The following information will be requested:

- ☐ Submit application completeness checklist (will be provided in Full Proposal Solicitation)
- ☐ Identify the Applicant's entity type. Explain how the Applicant is eligible for the requested funding program and whether the Applicant has legal authority to enter into a grant agreement with the State Water Board. Describe any legal agreements amongst applicant's partner agencies and/or organizations that ensure performance of the Proposal and tracking of funds. If applicable, include a copy of the certification of incorporation for the organization.
- ☐ Specify the requested grant amount (verify that the grant amount requested is between the minimum and maximum amount for the funding source).
- ☐ Describe how the minimum match requirement will be met, or if the Applicant is requesting a waiver (See Appendix D for more details).
- ☐ Describe why the proposed Project is eligible for funding.
- ☐ Describe whether the Applicant is a disadvantaged community.

B. Proposal Consistency with Concept Proposal & Responsiveness

Provide information to document that the scope of work is consistent with the concept proposal and describe any changes made or not made in response to the reviewer comments.

- ☐ Describe how the Full Proposal is consistent with the CP.
- ☐ Briefly describe any modifications made since the submittal of the CP and how they have impacted the scope of work.
- ☐ Briefly outline the concept proposal reviewer comments that you have incorporated. If reviewer comments have not been incorporated, explain why.

ii. PROGRAM-SPECIFIC ELIGIBILITY

C. Eligibility for Accelerated Selection and Contracting Procedure (ASCP)

Provide information to document eligibility for ASCP. Only Integrated Watershed Management Program (IWMP) Projects could be eligible for the ASCP. Projects must meet the requirements of Section 30948 of the Public Resources Code (PRC) (see Appendix C).

- ☐ Indicate whether this application is eligible for the ASCP. If yes, following will be required:
 - o Describe how the Project is part of an approved watershed management plan that is consistent with Water Code, Section 79078.
 - o Describe how the Project is fully permitted, including all California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requirements, and ready to be implemented.
 - o Identify whether the required matching funds or services are from non-State sources.

APPENDIX I-1

D. Integrated Watershed Management Planning Proposals (Proposition 40)

Provide documentation demonstrating that the proposed plan leads to a final IWMP plan that will be consistent with the “local watershed management plan” requirements (Section 79078 of the Water Code).

- ☐ Briefly describe how the proposed Plan will lead to a final plan that at the minimum will meet ALL of the requirements of Section 79078 of the Water Code. (See Appendix C for more details.)

E. Nonpoint Source (NPS) Pollution Control Program (Proposition 40)

Provide documentation demonstrating eligibility for NPS Pollution Control Program.

- ☐ Briefly describe how the Project is capable of sustaining water quality benefits for at least 20 years.
- ☐ Briefly describe the Project’s defined water quality or beneficial use goal.

F. NPS Implementation Program [Clean Water Act, Section 319(h) Program]

Provide documentation demonstrating eligibility for the NPS Implementation Program.

- ☐ Briefly describe the activities the Project will implement to achieve pollutant load reductions consistent with an established Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) or a TMDLs under development.
- ☐ Briefly discuss how the proposed activities are consistent with watershed plans. Provide documentation that addresses the USEPA required elements for watershed-based plans as required in Appendix F.
- ☐ Briefly describe whether the Project will report the following key data, as applicable: sediment and nutrient annual load reductions, linear feet of stream banks or acres of wetlands protected or restored.
- ☐ Briefly describe provisions for the proper operation and maintenance of the management practices for an appropriate period of time (e.g., 5-10 years).
- ☐ Briefly describe how the sediment and nutrient annual load reductions, linear feet of stream bank, or acres of wetlands protected or restored will be documented.

G. Coastal NPS Pollution Control Program Proposals (Proposition 50)

Provide documentation demonstrating eligibility the Coastal NPS Pollution Control Program.

- ☐ Briefly describe how the Project will sustain long-term water quality or environmental restoration or protection benefits for a period of 20 years.
- ☐ Briefly describe how the Project will address the cause of degradation (rather than the symptoms) of coastal waters.
- ☐ Briefly describe the Project’s consistency with water quality and resource protection plans prepared, implemented, or adopted by the State Water Board, the applicable Regional Water Board, and the California Coastal Commission.
- ☐ If applicable, describe the Project’s consistency with the existing coho salmon, steelhead trout, or other threatened or endangered species recovery plan. Describe how the Proposal seeks to implement actions specified in those plans.
- ☐ Provide information on whether the Project has received funds from the NPS Pollution Control Subaccount (Water Code, Section 79110).
- ☐ If applicable, describe how the Project meets the mutual priorities of the State Water Board and Ocean Protection Council. This information is only necessary for Projects seeking the \$10 million devoted to Ocean Protection Projects.

APPENDIX I-1

II. FULL PROPOSAL GENERAL DOCUMENTATION

A. Project Description, Objectives, and Outcomes

- ☐ Provide a detailed description of the proposed Project for which funding is requested.
- ☐ Provide a detailed map of the Project area, including the area and/or watershed encompassed by the Project, the location of the Project, disadvantaged communities within the region, and a narrative description of the Project.
- ☐ Identify the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed Project, and the manner in which they will be achieved.
- ☐ Provide a discussion of the important ecological processes and environmental resources within the watershed area affected by the Project.
- ☐ Describe the beneficial uses of the water body(ies) affected by the Project.
- ☐ Identify whether and how the Project targets specific water quality pollutants or parameters that are critical to the overall condition of the water resources in the area.

B. Project Team & Administration

- ☐ Describe how the applicant demonstrates the experience, knowledge, and skills necessary to successfully complete the Project. The Applicant may provide examples of past successes in completing previous grant funded projects.
- ☐ Describe the partnership agreements, corresponding roles, and institutional structure that will be used to ensure successful completion of the Project. This should include reference to the staff resources that will be used to finalize the grant agreement and successfully implement the Project.
- ☐ Identify project leaders within each cooperating entity to ensure consistent, long-term implementation of the Project.
- ☐ Provide resumes of key project team members and describe the percentage of time commitment by key staff.
- ☐ Indicate the entities responsible for the implementation of the Project, including each entity role. Provide a brief summary of the relationships of the cooperating entities, based on their ties to shared water resources or infrastructure, and identify project leaders within each entity participating in the Project.
- ☐ Provide other relevant supporting information that demonstrates the applicant's ability to successfully complete the Project.

C. Stakeholder Involvement & Coordination

- ☐ Identify stakeholders and the process used to include the stakeholders in the development of the Proposal.
- ☐ Discuss how the stakeholders:
 - ☐ Were/will be identified;
 - ☐ Have/will participate in the planning and implementation efforts; and
 - ☐ Influence decisions made regarding Project implementation.

APPENDIX I-1

- ☐ Discuss the mechanisms and processes that have been and will be used to facilitate stakeholder involvement and communication during implementation of the Project.
- ☐ Describe and document any public outreach activities directed towards specific stakeholder groups, as well as stakeholders not involved as Project participants, including disadvantaged communities and environmental justice communities.
- ☐ Include any letters of support from stakeholder groups.
- ☐ Discuss watershed and/or other partnerships developed during the Project planning process.
- ☐ Describe how the applicant will coordinate and cooperate with the relevant local, State, and Federal agencies during implementation of the proposed Project.

D. Financing/Funding Match

Provide documentation indicating a feasible Program of continued financing for implementation, operation, and maintenance of the Project and the applicant's ability to meet or exceed the minimum-funding match. **Indicating the availability of matching funds that later become unavailable will be considered a deviation from the proposed Project and may result in the grant being withdrawn.**

- ☐ Provide the funding match percentage, which meets or exceeds the minimum amount specified for the Program in the Guidelines. If the Applicant is requesting a waiver or reduction of the funding match, the Applicant must provide the information requested in Appendix D including a completed Exhibit A.
- ☐ Include a summary showing the financing mechanisms for all the related elements of the Project.
- ☐ Discuss the reliability of the proposed cost-sharing partner commitments, including whether the matching funds are dependant on actions by other entities.
- ☐ Describe the Applicant's ability to leverage other funds to complete the Project.
- ☐ If applicable, discuss the mechanisms for ongoing support and financing to continue operation and maintenance of the implemented Project.

E. Cost Estimate/Budget

- ☐ Discuss whether the costs are reasonable and relevant to the stated outcomes.
- ☐ Provide a reasonable estimate of cost for each task (e.g., line item) contained in the Proposal, including planning and design costs, construction costs, and funding match. Provide a summary of all costs rolled up into the cost summary table (see Table 1).
- ☐ Discuss whether all costs are directly related to Project implementation (i.e., no overhead).
- ☐ If applicable, provide cost estimates and funding sources for those tasks that are not proposed for funding but are related and important to the success of the proposed Project.
- ☐ Provide a description of any prior investments the applicant has made towards the Project (e.g., money previously spent on planning, design, or environmental compliance).

F. Disadvantaged Communities/Environmental Justice Communities

Provide information about how disadvantaged communities and environmental justice communities will be involved and will directly benefit from the proposed Project. All disadvantaged community claims will be evaluated and granted on a case-by-case basis.

- ☐ Identify if the applicant is a disadvantaged community. Provide background information to support any disadvantaged community claim.
- ☐ Provide the demographics of the Project users.

APPENDIX I-1

- ☐ Discuss disadvantaged communities within the Project area and how their representatives have been or will be involved in the planning and implementation process.
- ☐ Document the water supply and water quality needs of disadvantaged communities and how these needs have been or will be considered.
- ☐ Discuss how much direct benefit the Project provides to disadvantaged communities.
- ☐ Include a discussion of environmental justice communities that may be negatively impacted or will directly benefit from the Project.
- ☐ Describe how the Project leverages diverse local efforts and community-based collaborative strategies to involve low-income, minority, or other disadvantaged populations and ensure that benefits are distributed equitably.
- ☐ Explain the process for ensuring that environmental/health risks to disadvantaged communities are not increased and are preferably decreased, as a result of the Project.

G. Schedule

- ☐ Provide a schedule showing the sequence and timing for implementation of the proposed Project.
- ☐ Discuss how the schedule is consistent with the work plan and identify any possible obstacles to the Project implementation.
- ☐ Discuss the related elements of the Project, their current status, and how the applicant plans to ensure the timely completion of these related elements.

H. Scope of Work & Grant Agreement Template

Provide a detailed, concise, and specific scope of work to be used for preparing the grant agreement should the project be selected for funding.

- ☐ Clearly state the purpose for which funding is being requested.
- ☐ Provide a scope of work that is suitable for including in the grant agreement.
- ☐ Describe the specific purpose of each task, starting with an action verb and including details of how, when, and/or where the task will be accomplished. Identify how the Applicant will coordinate with the granting agency.
- ☐ Provide tasks within the grant time frame that are complete, detailed, and ready to be implemented. The tasks should be supported with the estimates used in the Budget (Section II.E).
- ☐ Include appropriate work item submittals (i.e., documentation of work item progression, progress and final reports).
- ☐ Provide a schedule of tasks with deliverable due dates in tabular format and verify that the tasks line up with the tasks in the schedule.

I. Education and Outreach

Provide documentation demonstrating that the Proposal incorporates education and outreach efforts.

- ☐ Describe how the Project promotes increased awareness and the adoption of management practices through the use of educational materials, activities, and/or technology transfer from this to other projects.
- ☐ Describe how the Project proposes a multi-year strategy for education and outreach to interested stakeholders beyond the Project participants.

APPENDIX I-1

***III. INTEGRATED WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PLANNING PROPOSALS
SUPPLEMENTAL SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS***

The information requested below is required for IWMP Planning Proposals. Only applicants seeking funds from IWMP funding source, for the development of local watershed management plans, are required to submit this information.

A. Impacts and Benefits

- ☐ Describe the how the proposed Plan will provide for an integrated approach and multiple benefits.
- ☐ Identify the communities and groups that will benefit from the Plan.
- ☐ Provide an evaluation and mitigation process for potential negative impacts within the region and adjacent areas that may result from the proposed Plan.
- ☐ If applicable, identify watershed and interregional benefits and impacts from the proposed Plan.

B. Technical/Scientific Merit and Assessment & Performance Measures

Provide documentation demonstrating the soundness of scientific and technical analyses used as the basis for the Proposal and the appropriateness of the assessment and performance measures.

- ☐ Briefly describe and submit a copy of the studies that have been conducted or will be conducted to support the planning process.
- ☐ Describe the types and amount of data that are available to support development of the Plan.
- ☐ Identify data gaps where additional monitoring or studies are needed.
- ☐ Discuss the data, technical methods, and analyses used in the selection of water management and watershed management strategies.
- ☐ Discuss measures that will be used to evaluate the planning process and how to adapt the planning process based on information and data collected.
- ☐ Identify and discuss how the appropriate expertise will be integrated and used throughout the planning process.
- ☐ Describe how the effectiveness of the Project will be monitored and assessed (e.g., Project Performance Measures Table – Appendix K).
- ☐ Describe the performance measures and how they will adequately demonstrate the project outcomes.
- ☐ Describe how the assessment and performance measures are supported by adequate documentation.
- ☐ Describe the post construction/initial implementation performance monitoring.

C. Relation to Local Planning & Agency Coordination

Provide document of coordination with agencies and local planning efforts.

- ☐ Describe how the identified action(s), Project, or study(ies) relates to planning documents established by local agencies.
- ☐ Identify existing planning and related documents (e.g., studies, reports, etc.) that will form the foundation for the local watershed management plan.
- ☐ Discuss how the Project will incorporate coordination with local land-use planning decision makers.
- ☐ Describe how the applicant will coordinate and cooperate with the relevant local, State, and Federal agencies in the development of the proposed Plan.

APPENDIX I-1

D. Watershed Management Plan Consistency

- ☐ Describe how the proposed Plan will fulfill the requirements for a local watershed management plan, as described in Section 79078 of the Water Code.

E. Watershed Management Strategies & Integration

- ☐ Discuss the range of water/watershed management strategies the Proposed Plan will consider.
- ☐ Discuss how the selected water/watershed management strategies will work together to provide reliable water management.
- ☐ Discuss the added benefits of the proposed integration of multiple water/watershed management strategies.
- ☐ If applicable, provide a discussion on why a water management strategy is not applicable.

F. Plan Implementation

- ☐ Provide a general schedule for implementation of the proposed Plan beyond the adoption of the proposed Plan, or a process to determine such a schedule.
- ☐ Describe how the proposed Plan will include an institutional structure or how such an institutional structure will be developed to ensure Plan implementation.
- ☐ Identify a mechanism or process that allows for monitoring the performance of the Plan and implementation and changes to the Plan.
- ☐ Identify beneficiaries and potential funding/financing for implementation of the proposed Plan.

G. Data Management

- ☐ Describe the process for gathering and managing data for development and implementation of the proposed Plan and disseminating data to stakeholders, agencies, and the public.
- ☐ Demonstrate how the proposed Plan's data management will support statewide needs.
- ☐ Discuss how the data gathering, analysis, and management tasks in the Proposal are consistent with the existing databases in corresponding agencies' databases.

APPENDIX I-1

IV. IMPLEMENTATION PROJECT SUPPLEMENTAL SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

A. Benefits, Outcomes, and Impacts

- ☐ Identify the recipients of the Project benefits.
- ☐ Discuss how the outcomes relate to the tasks identified in the Proposal.
- ☐ Describe how the Project will achieve broad benefits and significant environmental improvements.
- ☐ Quantify the anticipated environmental benefits (e.g., pollutant load reductions to be achieved by the Project). Describe how the Project will achieve quantifiable pollutant load reductions.
- ☐ Describe how the Project will contribute to the long-term attainment and maintenance of water quality objectives.
- ☐ Discuss how the Project provides multiple benefits.
- ☐ Describe how the Project will have benefits beyond the immediate Project area by demonstrating the feasibility of the proposed activities.
- ☐ Address any potential negative impacts within the region and adjacent areas that may result from Project implementation.
- ☐ Identify proposed mitigation measures for the potential negative impacts.
- ☐ Describe how the Project incorporates of a source reduction/pollution prevention strategy.
- ☐ Provide an evaluation of impacts/benefits to other resources.
- ☐ If applicable, identify the watershed and/or interregional benefits and impacts from the Project.

B. Plan Consistency & Relation to Local Planning

Provide documentation indicating that the proposed Project is consistent with an adopted Plan and that the applicant has adequately coordinated with other agencies and local planning efforts.

- ☐ Describe whether the Project is identified in an adopted watershed or other Plan identified in the Bond law. Include documentation of formal adoption of a Plan or a schedule for adoption. (Bonus points will be given for adopted plans and for plans that are adopted or recognized by multiple agencies.)
- ☐ For Projects that are part of a Plan, discuss whether the Project is identified as a priority for implementation within the timeframe of this grant process.
- ☐ If applicable, discuss past and future coordination efforts with the local land-use planning decision-makers.

C. Technical and Scientific Merit

Provide documentation that the Proposal is based on sound scientific and technical analysis and includes measures to assess performance.

- ☐ Include technically or scientifically sound concepts for achieving the stated objective(s) and outcome(s) of the Project.
- ☐ Describe how the information contained in the technical documents support the technical feasibility of the Project.
- ☐ Discuss the appropriateness of the proposed methods, approaches, technology, and analyses for the Project.
- ☐ Provide literature citation(s) relating to technical and scientific merit of the Project.
- ☐ Identify the technical expertise support that will be integrated and accessed throughout project implementation.

APPENDIX I-1

- ☐ Describe how the site is adequately characterized so that the technology will be effective for the proposed Project.
- ☐ Discuss how to adapt the process based on information and data collected.
- ☐ Describe how the data gaps will be identified and addressed.

D. Monitoring and Data Collection

- ☐ Describe a monitoring plan for the Project that is consistent with the project's goals, outcomes, and objectives.
- ☐ Discuss how the proposed monitoring activities will help to document project effectiveness (e.g., pollutant load reductions).
- ☐ Identify the appropriate parameters and frequency in the monitoring plan.
- ☐ Discuss whether the proposed monitoring activities are covered under an existing Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP), or if a QAPP will have to be developed.
- ☐ Discuss how appropriate statistical/data analysis mechanisms will be used throughout the Project.

E. Data Management and Analysis

- ☐ Describe how the data will be managed and made compatible with existing databases to support statewide data needs.
- ☐ If applicable, describe how the Proposal leverages existing monitoring efforts.
- ☐ Discuss the integration of data into the State Water Board's Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program (SWAMP) and/or Groundwater Ambient Monitoring Assessment (GAMA) Program.
- ☐ Provide a solid framework for data storage and transfer, including water quality and GIS data. Discuss how local watershed groups will be included.
- ☐ Describe how the proposed water quality monitoring plan sets a basis for demonstrating, mapping, and tracking long-term water quality improvements (include the use of geographic information system [GIS] technology).
- ☐ Describe how well the proposed monitoring plan addresses the requirements of QAPPs and how qualified the monitoring partners are to meet QAPP requirements.

F. Assessment and Performance Measures

- ☐ Describe the performance measures and how they will adequately demonstrate the project outcomes.
- ☐ Include specific indicators and/or measure of effectiveness that can be used to evaluate the successful achievement of the Project and overall watershed goals.
- ☐ Describe the post construction/initial implementation performance monitoring.
- ☐ Specify the methods that will be used to determine the pollutant load reductions and why the methods were chosen.
- ☐ Quantify the predicted load reductions, and how the load reductions were determined.
- ☐ Describe how the assessment and performance measures are supported by adequate documentation.
- ☐ Describe how the effectiveness of the Project will be monitored and assessed (e.g., Project Performance Measures Table – Appendix K).

APPENDIX I-1

V. PROGRAM-SPECIFIC SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

This section documents submittal requirements that are Program-specific which may have not have been directly covered in the other parts of the application. Each Proposal may receive up to 10 points based the information provided as part of the Program-Specific portion of the Proposal.

A. NONPOINT SOURCE (NPS) IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM (CLEAN WATER ACT [CWA], SECTION 319[H] PROGRAM), COASTAL NPS POLLUTION PROGRAM, & NPS POLLUTION CONTROL PROGRAM

- ☐ Include a list of partners that are in place to implement the Project as describe in the Proposal.
- ☐ Describe how the Project implements activities within a watershed to achieve implementation of actions necessary to restore an impaired water body and/or be in compliance with water quality objectives by 2008.
- ☐ Describe how the Project enhances comprehensive community-based watershed efforts.
- ☐ Describe how the Project leverages other funding sources, especially Farm Bill funding (e.g., EQIP), to accomplish more extensive implementation with measurable environmental results.
- ☐ Describe how the Project provides for tracking the extent of management measure implementation that will help the State determine progress toward the goal of implementing management measures by 2013.
- ☐ Identify and describe innovative practices or approaches utilized by the Project that will serve as demonstrations for future implementations.
- ☐ Include activities such as technical transfer and outreach to promote ongoing implementation beyond the current Project area.
- ☐ Include monitoring within the watershed and/or with statewide water quality assessment.
- ☐ Address whether the Project is part of a watershed-based plan for a waterbody with a completed total maximum daily load (TMDL).
- ☐ Describe how the Project integrates Section 319 and Farm Bill funding through coordination between State conservationists and local conservation districts.
- ☐ Discuss how the Project implements appropriate watershed best management practices or management measures.
- ☐ Describe how the Project will achieve broad implementation that will achieve significant water quality results.

B. URBAN STORMWATER PROGRAM

- ☐ Describe how the Project is designed to reuse, detain, filter, or recharge stormwater onsite to minimize sediment and pollutant transport downstream.
- ☐ Discuss how the Project reduces the combined sewer overflows in existing urban areas.
- ☐ Describe the Projects aims to increase, maintain, or restore riparian function or wetland areas.
- ☐ Describe the integration of low-impact development (LID) techniques into the site design such as detention and infiltration ponds, or flow attenuation devices to help reduce the impact of development and maintain pre-developed hydrologic conditions.
- ☐ Describe how the Project is designed to decrease the concentration of a constituent(s) measured at the Project site before and after water flows through natural filtering devices (e.g., grassy swales, grassy filter strips, tree box filters, etc.).

APPENDIX I-1

C. AGRICULTURAL WATER QUALITY GRANT PROGRAM (AWQGP)

- ☐ Discuss how the Project assists in the implementation of an established or under development total maximum daily load (TMDL).
- ☐ Describe how the Project contributes to the long-term attainment and maintenance of water quality standards.
- ☐ Describe implementation strategies and solutions and how they coordinate with existing watershed management efforts to implement a regional, watershed-based approach.
- ☐ Discuss how the Project incorporates a source reduction/pollution prevention strategy.
- ☐ Describe how the Project uses established management measures in achieving its goals and objectives.
- ☐ Describe how the Project (including tasks funded by non-AWQGP sources) proposes to meet its goals, objectives, and outcomes without relying on future phases of funding.

D. INTEGRATED WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

- ☐ Discuss how the local watershed management plan associated with the Proposal defines the geographical boundaries of the watershed including the natural resource conditions in the watershed.
- ☐ Describe how the Proposal quantifies the multiple benefits to be achieved by implementation of the Project.
- ☐ Describe how the Proposal demonstrates substantive partnerships among a diverse group of active stakeholders and show diverse involvement in determining needs, methods, and outcomes of the Project.
- ☐ Discuss the implementation of one or more elements listed in Summary Table of 2005-06 Consolidated Grant Program (Appendix A of the Guidelines).
- ☐ Describe how the Proposal will meet and integrate multiple partner agency priorities. (See Appendix G for a list of California Water Boards and partner agency priorities.)
- ☐ Describe how the Project is interrelated and works to enhance, preserve, and/or improve the watershed.
- ☐ If the Proposal includes more than one Project, clearly identify the linkages or interdependence between the Projects.

APPENDIX I-1

VI. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION/GENERAL PROGRAM QUESTIONS

- ☐ Has the scope of work been modified from what was proposed at the Concept Proposal phase? If yes, please elaborate and briefly discuss the reason for modification or reference the section of the Proposal where documentation is provided.
- ☐ Does this Project satisfy, in part or in full, the requirements of any California Water Boards regulation, permit, or order?
- ☐ Are you aware that, once the Proposal has been submitted to State Water Board, any privacy rights as well as other confidentiality protections offered by law with respect to the application package and project location are waived? Please review the “Confidentiality” discussion in the Guidelines and document any comments with respect to this requirement.
- ☐ Are you aware that grant agreements funded by the State Water Board will specify that acceptance of grant funds constitutes a waiver of litigation rights (including pending actions) to challenge any State Water Board or Regional Water Board regulation or order, which is reasonably related to the purpose of the grant? Please document any comments relevant to this requirement.
- ☐ Are you aware that projects funded under the grant program must comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and/or National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)? Please document any comments relevant to this requirement and reference sections of the Proposal where more details are provided.
- ☐ Which statewide priorities (Section III.C of the Guidelines) your proposal meets? Please list and reference the sections of the application where documentation is provided.
- ☐ Does the proposed Project include any modification of a river or stream channel? If yes, briefly discuss how these impacts will be mitigated and reference sections of the application where full documentation of this information is provided.
- ☐ Does the proposed plan/project have any implications with respect to conflict between water users, water rights disputes, and/or interregional water rights issues? Please discuss briefly and if applicable reference sections of the Proposal where additional detail is provided.
- ☐ Are the applicant and/or cooperating entities in violation of any water right permit requirements including, payment of fees? If yes, please elaborate and discuss the status or progress towards resolving the violation.
- ☐ Does the Project assist in meeting one or more of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program goals? If yes, the Project must be consistent with the CALFED Programmatic Record of Decision. Please discuss or reference the section of the Proposal where this information is documented.

APPENDIX I-1

Table 1 - Example Cost Estimate Table

Provide a reasonable estimate of cost for all tasks (e.g., line item) including planning and design costs, construction costs. If the proposal includes more than one project, complete the following table for each project in the proposal package for which funding is requested.

COST ESTIMATE TABLE				
PROPOSAL TITLE AND PIN NUMBER:				
Budget Category		Non-State Share (Funding Match)	Requested State Share (Grant Funding)	Total
(a)	Direct Project Administration Costs			
(b)	Land Purchase/Easement			
(c)	Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation			
(d)	Construction/Implementation			
(e)	Environmental Compliance/Mitigation/Enhancement			
(f)	Project Summary [Sum (a) through (e) for each column]			
(g)	Construction Administration			
(h)	Other (Explain): _____			
(i)	Construction/Implementation Contingency			
(j)	Grant Total [Sum (f) through (i) for each column]			
Source(s) of funds for Non-State Share (Funding Match)				

APPENDIX I-1

Budget Category Explanations

- (a) *Direct Project Administration Costs* – Includes: salaries, wages, fringe benefits, office supplies, and equipment needed to support the project, staff travel costs (at or below the rate allowed for unrepresented State employees), and preparation of required quarterly and final reports. This budget category includes all such costs for the grant recipient and any partner agencies or organizations. Applicants are encouraged to limit such costs to less than 5% of the total proposal costs. Such administrative expenses are the necessary costs incidentally but directly related to the proposal.
- (b) *Land Purchase/Easement* – If land acquisition is to be included in the Non-State Share, include whether it is a proposed acquisition, or if the land is already owned. Prior purchase of land can be included in an applicant's funding match if purchased after adoption of the Guideline. Land acquisition costs will not be considered a reimbursable item if purchased prior to the effective date of the grant agreement. For land purchased prior to the date of the application include the date of purchase and purchase price of the land. Costs for easements will be handled similarly as for land purchases.
- (c) *Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation* – For these efforts, differentiate costs between consulting services and/or agency/organization staff costs. Planning costs include: planning efforts, reconnaissance studies, feasibility studies, and preliminary reports. Design and engineering costs include: conceptual, preliminary and final design efforts, geotechnical reports, hydraulic studies, water quality investigations and efforts, and other engineering types of work. Include the costs of bid preparation and processing here. Environmental documentation costs include all efforts involved in the CEQA or NEPA process up to the point of the Notice of Determination, Finding of No Significant Impact, or Record of Decision.
- (d) *Construction/Implementation* – Includes the summary of labor, materials, and equipment purchases and/or rentals. After bids are received these costs will be the actual construction cost awarded to the qualified low bidder. The construction or implementation costs for Pilot Projects should be included here.
- (e) *Environmental Compliance/Mitigation/Enhancement* – Includes those costs required by a CEQA/NEPA document to offset any potential damages caused by the proposal. If these costs are included in the contract awarded for construction or implementation of the proposal, differentiate such costs for purposes of this budget.
- (f) *Project Summary* – The summation of the costs for items (a) through (e) above.
- (g) *Construction Administration* – Includes those costs required to supervise and administer the construction or implementation of the project. Differentiate costs between consulting services and agency staff costs to perform this work.
- (h) *Other* – Includes costs for legal services, license fees, permits, any implementation verification costs, and any monitoring and assessment costs required during the construction/implementation of the proposal. Do not include monitoring and assessment costs for efforts required after construction/implementation of the proposal is complete. These costs are considered to be operation and maintenance costs and are not reimbursable.
- (i) *Construction/Implementation Contingency* – Includes any contingency costs for the construction/ implementation of the proposal. Specify the percentage used for this contingency cost. For all other contingency costs (i.e. design, land purchase, etc.) include those contingencies in the appropriate cost category.
- (j) *Grand Total [Sum (f) through (i) for each column]* – The summation of the costs for items (f) through (i) above.

DRAFT: Under Management and Legal Review

Appendix I-2

FULL PROPOSAL ELIGIBILITY AND EVALUATION CRITERIA

Section B includes the Full Proposal eligibility and evaluation criteria that will be used by reviewers. This Section is broken into following tables. The Full Proposal scoring criteria to be used by the reviewers is shown below. The maximum possible score for the Integrated Watershed Management Program Planning Grants is 118 points. The maximum possible score for the Implementation Grants is 118 points.

FULL PROPOSAL EVALUATION TABLES		
TABLE	TITLE	
Table 1	Full Proposal Eligibility Review (all grant programs) (includes eligibility for Accelerated Selection and Contracting Procedure)	Eligible/Ineligible
Table 2	Full Proposal General Evaluation Criteria (all grant programs)	Maximum Score = 53
Table 3	Full Proposal Evaluation Criteria for Integrated Watershed Management Program Planning Projects	Maximum Score = 55
Table 4	Full Proposal Evaluation Criteria for Implementation Projects (for all grant programs except Integrated Watershed Management Program <u>Planning</u> Projects)	Maximum Score = 55
Table 5	Full Proposal Grant-Specific Evaluation Criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Coastal Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Program▪ Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Program▪ Nonpoint Source Implementation Program▪ Urban Stormwater Program▪ Agricultural Water Quality Grant Program▪ Integrated Watershed Management Program	Maximum Score = 10
Table 6	Full Proposal Additional Information/General Program Questions (for Reviewers/Consensus Reviewers to complete)	Not Applicable

DRAFT: Under Management and Legal Review
Appendix I-2

SCORING

Unless otherwise noted, each criterion will be scored on a scale of 0 to 5, 0 to 10, or 0 to 15 with a 0 being “low” and a 5, 10, or 15 being “high.” Points are then assigned to the Full Proposal for each criterion, as follows:

- A score of 5, 10, or 15 points will be awarded where the criterion is fully addressed and supported by logical rationale.
- A score of 3-4, 7-9, or 11-14 points will be awarded where the criterion is fully addressed but is marginally supported by logical rationale.
- A score of 2, 4-6, or 5-9 points will be awarded where the criterion is marginally addressed and is marginally supported by logical rationale.
- A score of 1, 1-3, or 1-4 point(s) will be awarded where the criterion is marginally addressed and is not supported by logical rationale.
- A score of 0 point will be awarded where the applicant is not responsive (i.e., the criterion is not addressed and no rationale is presented).

Appendix I-2

Table 1: Full Proposal Eligibility Review

Criteria	Response/Comments
<p>ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA</p> <p><i>The Eligibility Criteria listed below will be used to screen Full Proposals for all of the funding programs. This table is broken into the following three sections: (i) General Eligibility (A – B); (ii) Program-Specific Eligibility (C – G); and (iii) Eligibility Determination.</i></p>	
<p><i>i. General Eligibility (A – B)</i></p> <p><i>Below are general eligibility criteria, which applies to all grant programs. State Water Board staff will do this portion of the eligibility review. A “No” response in Sections A – B indicates the Proposal may not be eligible for funding. The Review Liaison should be notified and the Full Proposal should not be scored until the Review Liaison makes a determination.</i></p>	
<p>A. Eligibility Screening</p> <p><i>The determination will be based on whether the Proposal meets the eligibility requirements outlined in the Guidelines.</i></p> <p>1. What type of entity is the Applicant? <div> <div>Public Agency</div> <div>Local Public Agency</div> <div>State Agency</div> </div> <div> <div>Non-Profit Organization</div> <div>Educational Institution</div> <div>Other: (specify) _____</div> </div> </p> <p>2. Is the <u>Applicant</u> eligible to receive funding under the selected Program?</p> <p>3. Is the <u>Project</u> eligible for funding under the selected Program?</p> <p>4. Is the <u>Applicant</u> a disadvantaged community?</p> <p>5. Does the budget provide a funding match percentage, which meets or exceeds the minimum amount specified for funding programs in the Guidelines?</p> <p>6. Is the <u>Application</u> complete?</p>	<p>Yes/No</p> <p>Yes/No</p> <p>Yes/No</p> <p>Yes/No</p> <p>Yes/No</p>
<p>B. Proposal Consistency with Concept Proposal & Responsiveness</p> <p><i>The determination will be based on whether the Full Proposal is consistent with the Concept Proposal and incorporates the Concept Proposal reviewer comments.</i></p> <p>1. Is the Project listed in the full proposal consistent with the Concept Proposal and reviewer’s comments? Explain your response in the text box provided.</p>	<p>Yes/No</p>

DRAFT: Under Management and Legal Review
Appendix I-2

Table 1: Full Proposal Eligibility Review

Criteria	Response/Comments
ii. Program – Specific Eligibility (C-G) <i>Below are program-specific eligibility criteria. Section C applies only to the Integrated Watershed Management Program (IWMP). A “No” response in Section C indicates the Full Proposal is NOT eligible for the Accelerated Selection and Contracting Procedure (ASCP). Sections D-G apply to all of the funding programs. A “No” response in Sections C-G indicates the Proposal may not be eligible for funding. The Review Liaison should be notified and the Full Proposal should NOT be scored until the Review Liaison makes a determination.</i>	
C. Eligibility for Accelerated Selection and Contracting Procedure (ASCP) <i>For the IWMP, Projects are eligible for the ASCP if consistent with Section 30948 of the Public Resources Code (PRC).</i>	
1. Section 30948 of the PRC allows an ASCP for Projects that meet ALL of the following requirements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Is the Project part of an approved watershed management plan consistent with Water Code, Section 79078? b. Is the Project fully permitted, including all California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requirements, and is the Project ready to be implemented? c. Are the matching funds or services from non-State sources? 	Yes/No Yes/No Yes/No
2. Is the IWMP Project eligible for the ASCP?	YES/NO (All “Yes” for Section A means eligible for ASCP.)
D. Coastal Nonpoint Source (NPS) Pollution Control Program <i>Screening will be based on how well the applicant demonstrates that the Proposal meets the specific Coastal NPS Pollution Control Program criteria outlined below.</i>	
1. Does the Project demonstrate the capability to contribute to sustained, long-term water quality or environmental restoration or protection benefits for a period of 20 years?	Yes/No
2. Does the Project address the causes of degradation (rather than the symptoms) of coastal waters?	Yes/No
3. Is the Project consistent with water quality and resource protection plans prepared, implemented, or adopted by the State Water Board, the applicable Regional Water Board, and the California Coastal Commission?	Yes/No
4. If applicable, is the Project consistent with an existing coho salmon, steelhead trout, or other threatened or endangered species recovery plan? To the extent feasible, does the Proposal seek to implement actions specified in those plans?	Yes/No/Not Applicable
5. Has the Project received funds from the Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Subaccount (Water Code, Section 79110)?	Yes/No
6. For the \$10 million devoted to Ocean Protection Projects, does the Project meet a mutual priority of the State Water Board and Ocean Protection Council?	Yes/No/Not Applicable
E. Nonpoint Source (NPS) Pollution Control Program <i>Screening will be based on whether the applicant meets the stated criteria.</i>	
1. Does the Proposal demonstrate that the Project is capable of sustaining water quality benefits for at least 20 years?	Yes/No
2. Does the Proposal demonstrate that the Project has a defined water quality or beneficial use goal?	Yes/No

DRAFT: Under Management and Legal Review
Appendix I-2

Table 1: Full Proposal Eligibility Review

Criteria	Response/Comments
<p>F. Nonpoint Source (NPS) Implementation Program [Clean Water Act, Section 319(h) Program] <i>Screening will be based on whether the applicant demonstrates that the Proposal meets the specific NPS Implementation Program criteria.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Does the Project implement activities to achieve pollutant load reductions consistent with an established total maximum daily load (TMDL) or a TMDL under development? Yes/No Are the proposed activities consistent with watershed plans that address the USEPA required elements for watershed-based plans, as documented in the completed table? Yes/No Will the Project report the following key data, as applicable: sediment and nutrient annual load reductions, linear feet of stream banks or acres of wetlands protected or restored? Yes/No/Not Applicable Does the Proposal include provisions for the proper operation and maintenance of the practices for an appropriate period of time (e.g., 5-10 years)? Yes/No Does the Proposal state how the Project will document sediment and nutrient annual load reductions, linear feet of stream bank or acres of wetlands protected or restored? Yes/No 	
<p>G. Integrated Watershed Management Plans (Planning) <i>For the Integrated Watershed Management Program (IWMP), the proposed Plan must be consistent with the “local watershed management plan” requirements (Section 79078 of the Water Code), which are outlined in a-h below. Scoring will be based on how well the proposed Plan fulfills or will fulfill the requirements.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Section 79078 of the Water Code defines a local watershed management plan as a plan that includes the following elements: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Will a local watershed group develop the proposed Plan? If so, which group? <div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; width: 300px; margin: 5px 0;"></div> Will the proposed Plan define the geographical boundaries of the watershed? Yes/No Will the proposed Plan describe the natural resource conditions within the watershed? Yes/No Will the proposed Plan describe measurable characteristics for water quality improvements? Yes/No Will the proposed Plan describe methods for achieving and sustaining water quality improvements? Yes/No Will the proposed Plan identify any persons, organizations, or public agencies that are responsible for implementing the methods for achieving and sustaining water quality improvements? Yes/No Will the proposed Plan provide milestones for implementing the methods for achieving and sustaining water quality improvements? Yes/No Will the proposed Plan describe a monitoring program designed to measure the effectiveness of the methods for achieving and sustaining water quality improvements? Yes/No Does the Project include development of local watershed management plan that meets ALL of the requirements of Section 79078 of the Water Code? YES/NO <p>(All “yes” for Section E equals “YES”).</p>	

DRAFT: Under Management and Legal Review

Appendix I-2

Table 1: Full Proposal Eligibility Review

Criteria	Response/Comments
<i>iii. Eligibility Determination</i> <i>Below are the criteria that will be used to determine if the Full Proposal is eligible. Only eligible Proposals will be scored. Notify the Review Liaison if the Proposal is ineligible and do not score the Proposal until an eligibility determination is made by the Review Liaison.</i>	
1. Is the Proposal eligible for the requested funding program? (IF THE RESPONSE IS NO, NOTIFY THE REVIEW LIAISON.)	Yes/No
2. Is the application complete? (IF THE RESPONSE IS NO, NOTIFY THE REVIEW LIAISON.)	Yes/No
3. Is the Proposal eligible for the ASCP? (IF THE RESPONSE IS YES, NOTIFY THE REVIEW LIAISON.)	Yes/No
4. This Proposal qualifies for: (Select all that apply from the list below.) Coastal Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Program Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Program Nonpoint Source Implementation Program Urban Stormwater Program Agricultural Water Quality Grant Program Integrated Watershed Management Program – Planning Integrated Watershed Management Program – Implementation	
5. Should the Full Proposal be scored? If yes, for which Program? (Select <u>ONE</u> Program from list below.) Coastal Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Program Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Program Nonpoint Source Implementation Program Urban Stormwater Program Agricultural Water Quality Grant Program Integrated Watershed Management Program – Planning Integrated Watershed Management Program – Implementation	Yes/No

DRAFT: Under Management and Legal Review
Appendix I-2

Table 2: Full Proposal General Evaluation Criteria

Criteria	Maximum Score
GENERAL CRITERIA <i>The General Criteria listed below will be used to evaluate Full Proposals for all of the funding programs.</i>	
A. Project Description, Objectives, & Outcomes <i>Scoring will be based on whether the Full Proposal is consistent with the Project and the applicant has adequately described the Project, objectives, and outcomes.</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Does the Proposal include a detailed description of the Project(s) for which funding is requested? Is a map(s) of the Project area provided, including the area encompassed by the Project, the location of the Project, disadvantaged communities within the region, and a narrative description? Does the Proposal clearly identify the Project goals, objectives, outcomes, and the manner in which they will be achieved? Does the Proposal discuss important and relevant ecological processes and environmental resources within the watershed area affected by the Project? Does the Proposal include a description of the beneficial uses of the water body(ies) affected? Does the Proposal target specific water quality pollutants or parameters that are critical to the overall condition of the water resources in the area? 	10
B. Project Team & Administration <i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has demonstrated the resources, experience, and ability to successfully complete the Project identified in the Proposal.</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Does the applicant demonstrate the experience, knowledge, and skills necessary to successfully complete the Project? Does the applicant describe the partnership agreements, corresponding roles, and institutional structure that will ensure successful completion of the Project? Does the applicant identify Project leaders within each cooperating entity to ensure consistent, long-term implementation of the Project? 	5
C. Stakeholder Involvement & Coordination <i>Scoring will be based on whether development and implementation of the Project includes stakeholder involvement through a collaborative process.</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Does the Proposal include a discussion of how stakeholders: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Were / will be identified; Have / will participate in planning and implementation efforts; and Influence decisions made in planning and Project implementation? Does the Project describe outreach activities directed towards specific stakeholder groups, as well as stakeholders not involved as Project participants, including disadvantaged communities and environmental justice communities? Are there letters of support for the Project from stakeholder groups? Does the Proposal discuss watershed and/or other partnerships developed/to be developed during the planning process? Does the Proposal describe how the applicant will coordinate and cooperate with the relevant local, State, and Federal agencies during implementation of the proposed Project? 	5

DRAFT: Under Management and Legal Review
Appendix I-2

Table 2: Full Proposal General Evaluation Criteria

Criteria	Maximum Score
<p>D. Financing/Funding Match <i>Scoring will be based on whether the Proposal describes a feasible program of continued financing for implementation, operation, and maintenance of the Project.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Does the budget provide a funding match percentage, which meets or exceeds the minimum amount specified for the Program in the Guidelines? Does the Proposal include a summary showing the financing mechanisms for all the related elements of the Project? How reliable are the proposed cost-sharing partner commitments? (For example, are the matching funds dependent on some uncertain actions by other entities?) Does the applicant have the ability to leverage other funds to complete the Project? If applicable, does the Proposal describe the mechanism for ongoing support and financing for the continued operation and maintenance of the implemented Project? 	5
<p>E. Cost Estimate/Budget <i>Scoring will be based on whether the costs of the proposed Project are well presented and reasonable.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Are the costs reasonable and relevant to the stated outcomes? Does the applicant provide a reasonable estimate of costs for each task (e.g., line item) contained in the Proposal, including planning and design costs, construction costs, and funding match? Are all costs directly related to Project implementation (i.e., no overhead)? If applicable, are cost estimates and funding sources provided for those tasks that are not proposed for funding, but are related and important to the success of the proposed Project? Does the applicant have prior investment(s) in the Project (e.g., money previously spent on planning, design, or environmental compliance)? 	5
<p>F. Disadvantaged Communities/Environmental Justice Communities <i>Scoring will be based on the degree that disadvantaged and environmental justice communities are involved and will benefit from the proposed Project.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the Applicant a disadvantaged community? Does the Applicant discuss disadvantaged communities within the Project area and how their representatives have been/will be involved in the planning and implementation process? Does the Proposal document water supply and water quality needs of disadvantaged communities and how these needs have been or will be considered? Will the proposed Project provide direct benefit to disadvantaged communities? Does the Proposal include a discussion of environmental justice communities that may be negatively impacted or will directly benefit from the Project? How well does the Project leverage diverse local efforts and community-based collaborative strategies to involve low-income, minority, or other disadvantaged populations and ensure that benefits are distributed equitably? How well does the Proposal explain the process for ensuring that environmental/health risks to disadvantaged communities are not increased and are preferably decreased, as a result of the Project? 	5

DRAFT: Under Management and Legal Review
Appendix I-2

Table 2: Full Proposal General Evaluation Criteria

Criteria	Maximum Score
<p>G. Schedule <i>Scoring will be based on the reasonableness of the proposed schedule and readiness to proceed.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Does the applicant provide a schedule showing the sequence and timing for implementation of the Project? Does the applicant demonstrate how the schedule is consistent with the work plan and identify possible obstacles to Project implementation? Does the applicant discuss the related elements of the Project, their current status, and how the applicant plans to ensure the timely completion of these related elements? 	5
<p>H. Scope of Work & Grant Agreement Template <i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant presents a detailed and specific scope of work and grant agreement, which adequately documents the proposed Project.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Has the Applicant provided a scope of work that is suitable for including in the grant agreement? Does each task have a specific purpose, starting with an action verb and containing detail of how, when, and/or where it will be accomplished? Are the tasks complete, detailed, and ready to be implemented within the grant time frame? Do the work items include appropriate work item submittals (i.e., documentation of work item progression, progress and final reports)? Does the scope of work identify synergies or linkages between and among the work items? Is the purpose for which funding is being requested clear? Is a schedule of tasks provided with deliverable due dates in tabular format and do the tasks line up with the tasks in the schedule? 	10
<p>I. Education and Outreach <i>Scoring will be based on how well the applicant demonstrates that the Proposal incorporates education and outreach efforts.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Does the Project promote increased awareness and adoption of management practices through the use of educational materials, activities, and/or technology transfer from this to other Projects? Does the Proposal include a multi-year strategy for education and outreach to interested stakeholders beyond the Project participants? 	3
Full Proposal GENERAL Evaluation Criteria Maximum Score:	53

Appendix I-2

Table 3: Full Proposal Evaluation Criteria for Integrated Watershed Management Program Planning Projects

Criteria	Maximum Score
PLANNING PROJECT CRITERIA <i>The Planning Project Criteria listed below will be used to evaluate Planning Project Proposals. Only Projects seeking Integrated Watershed Management Program funds are eligible for evaluation using the Planning evaluation criteria. Separate criteria will be used to evaluate Implementation Project Proposals.</i>	
A. Impacts & Benefits <i>Scoring will be based on whether the Proposal clearly and fully describes the impacts and benefits of the Project.</i> 1. How well does the Project provide for an integrated approach and multiple benefits? 2. Does the Proposal identify communities and groups that will benefit from the Project? 3. Does the Proposal include an evaluation and mitigation process for potential negative impacts within the region and adjacent areas that may result from implementing the Project? 4. If applicable, does the Proposal identify watershed and interregional benefits and impacts from the Project?	10
B. Technical/Scientific Merit and Assessment & Performance Measures <i>Scoring will be based on whether the Proposal is based on sound scientific and technical analysis and includes measures to assess performance.</i> 1. Have or will technical studies been conducted to support the planning process? 2. Will available data adequately support the proposed planning and have data gaps been identified? 3. Does the Proposal include a discussion of data, technical methods, and analyses used in the selection of water management and watershed management strategies? 4. Does the Proposal discuss measures that will be used to evaluate the planning process and how to adapt the planning process based on information and data collected? 5. Does the Proposal identify how the appropriate expertise will be integrated and used throughout the planning process? 6. Are the performance measures appropriate and will they adequately demonstrate Project outcomes? 7. Does the Proposal contain specific indicators and/or measures of effectiveness that can be used to evaluate the successful achievement of both the Project and overall watershed goals? 8. Does the Proposal contain a discussion on post construction/initial implementation performance monitoring and does it appear to be reasonable? 9. How well does the Proposal describe how the effectiveness of the Project will be monitored and assessed (e.g., Project Performance Measures Table)?	10

Appendix I-2

Table 3: Full Proposal Evaluation Criteria for Integrated Watershed Management Program Planning Projects

Criteria	Maximum Score
<p>C. Relation to Local Planning & Agency Coordination <i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant adequately coordinates with agencies and local planning efforts.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Does the Proposal describe how the identified action(s), Project, or study(ies) relate to planning documents established by local agencies? Does the Proposal identify existing planning and related documents (e.g. studies, reports, etc.) that will form the foundation for the local watershed management plan? Does the Proposal demonstrate coordination with local land-use planning decision-makers? Does the Proposal describe how the applicant will coordinate and cooperate with the relevant local, State, and Federal agencies in development of the proposed Plan? 	10
<p>D. Watershed Management Plan Consistency <i>Scoring will be based on how well the proposed Plan fulfills the requirements.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> How well does the proposed Plan fulfill the requirements for a local watershed management plan, as described in Section 79078 of the Water Code? 	10
<p>E. Water Management Strategies & Integration <i>Scoring will be based on how well the proposed Plan integrates a wide range of water management strategies.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Does the proposed Plan describe a wide range of water / watershed management strategies? Does the applicant discuss how the selected water / watershed management strategies work together to provide reliable water management? Is a discussion of the added benefits of the proposed integration of multiple water / watershed management strategies provided? If applicable, is a brief discussion of why a water management strategy is not applicable provided? 	5

Appendix I-2

Table 3: Full Proposal Evaluation Criteria for Integrated Watershed Management Program Planning Projects

Criteria	Maximum Score
<p>F. Plan Implementation <i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately detailed Plan implementation.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Does the Proposal have a general schedule for implementation of the proposed Plan beyond adoption, or a process to determine such a schedule? Does the Proposal describe how the proposed Plan will include an institutional structure to ensure Plan implementation? If not, does the proposed Plan describe how such an institutional structure will be developed to ensure Plan implementation? Is there a mechanism or process identified in the Proposal that allows for monitoring the performance of the Plan and implementation and changes to the Plan? Does the Proposal identify beneficiaries and identify potential funding/financing for implementation of the proposed Plan? 	5
<p>G. Data Management <i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant presents detailed and specific data management procedures.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Does the Proposal describe the process for gathering and managing data for development and implementation of the proposed Plan and disseminating data to stakeholders, agencies, and the public? Does the Proposal demonstrate how the proposed Plan's data management will support statewide needs? Are the data gathering, analysis, and management tasks identified in the Proposal consistent with existing databases in corresponding agencies' databases? 	5
Full Proposal Evaluation Criteria – PLANNING Project Maximum Score:	55

Appendix I-2

Table 4: Full Proposal Evaluation Criteria for Implementation Projects

Criteria	Maximum Score
IMPLEMENTATION PROJECT CRITERIA <i>The Implementation Project Criteria listed below will be used to evaluate Implementation Project Proposals. Separate criteria will be used to evaluate Planning Project Proposals.</i>	
A. Benefits, Outcomes, & Impacts <i>Scoring will be based on whether the Proposal clearly and fully describes the benefits, outcomes, and impacts of the Project.</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Does the Proposal identify the recipients of the benefits resulting from the Project? Do the outcomes relate to the tasks identified in the Proposal? Will the Project achieve broad benefits and significant environmental improvements? Does the Proposal quantify the anticipated environmental benefits (e.g., pollutant load reductions to be achieved by the Project)? Does the Project contribute to the long-term attainment and maintenance of water quality objectives? Will the Project achieve multiple benefits? Will the Project have benefits beyond the immediate Project area by demonstrating the feasibility of the proposed activities? Does the Proposal adequately address any potential negative impacts that may result from implementing the Project? If potential negative impacts are identified, does the Proposal identify the proposed mitigation measures? How well does the Project incorporate a source reduction/pollution prevention strategy? Is an evaluation of impacts/benefits to other resources provided? If applicable, does the Proposal identify watershed and/or interregional benefits and impacts from the Project? Does the Proposal describe how the Project will achieve quantifiable pollutant load reductions? 	15
B. Plan Consistency & Relation to Local Planning <i>Scoring will be based on whether the Project is consistent with an adopted Plan and whether the applicant adequately coordinates with agencies and local planning efforts.</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the Project identified in an adopted watershed or other Plan identified in the Bond law? Does the Proposal include documentation of formal adoption of a Plan or a schedule of adoption? (Bonus points will be given for adopted plans and for plans that are adopted or recognized by multiple agencies.) For Projects that are part of a Plan, is the Project identified as a priority for implementation within the timeframe of this grant process? If applicable, does the Proposal demonstrate coordination with local land-use planning decision-makers? 	5

DRAFT: Under Management and Legal Review
Appendix I-2

Table 4: Full Proposal Evaluation Criteria for Implementation Projects

Criteria	Maximum Score
<p>C. Technical & Scientific Merit</p> <p><i>Scoring will be based on whether the Proposal is based on sound scientific and technical analysis and includes measures to assess performance.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Does the Proposal present technically or scientifically sound concepts for achieving the stated objective(s) and outcome(s)? Does the information contained in the Proposal support the technical feasibility of the Project? Are the proposed methods, approaches, technology, and analyses appropriate for the Project? Are literature citations relating to technical and scientific merit of the Project included in the Proposal? Does the Proposal identify the technical expertise support that will be integrated and accessed throughout the implementation process? Is the site adequately characterized so that the technology will be effective for the proposed Project? Does the Proposal discuss how to adapt the process based on information and data collected? Does the Proposal indicate how to identify and deal with the Project's data gaps? 	15
<p>D. Monitoring & Data Collection</p> <p><i>Scoring will be based on whether the Applicant presents an adequate monitoring and data collection program.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Does the Proposal describe a monitoring plan that is consistent with the Project's goals, outcomes, and objectives? Will the proposed monitoring activities help to document Project effectiveness (e.g., pollutant load reductions)? Does the monitoring plan identify appropriate parameters and frequency? Are the proposed monitoring activities covered under an existing Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP), or will a QAPP have to be developed? Does the Proposal include mechanisms for appropriate statistical/data analysis? 	5
<p>E. Data Management & Analysis</p> <p><i>Scoring will be based on whether the Applicant presents an adequate data management and analysis program.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> How well does the proposed water quality monitoring plan set a basis for demonstrating, mapping, and tracking long-term water quality improvements (may include the use of geographic information system [GIS] technology)? If applicable, does the Proposal leverage existing monitoring efforts? Does the Proposal discuss the integration of data into the State Water Board's Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program (SWAMP) and/or Groundwater Ambient Monitoring Assessment (GAMA) Program? Does the Proposal include a discussion of how the data will be managed and made compatible with existing databases to support statewide data needs? How well does the proposed monitoring plan address the requirements of the QAPPs? How qualified are the monitoring partners to meet QAPP requirements? Does the proposed Project provide a solid framework for data storage and transfer, including water quality and GIS data? With local watershed groups? 	5

Appendix I-2

<i>Table 4: Full Proposal Evaluation Criteria for Implementation Projects</i>	
Criteria	Maximum Score
<p>F. Assessment & Performance Measures</p> <p><i>Scoring will be based on how well the applicant demonstrates an adequate assessment program that includes performance measures that will allow a determination of whether the objectives of the Project are met.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Are the performance measures appropriate and will they adequately demonstrate Project outcomes? 2. Does the Proposal contain specific indicators and/or measure of effectiveness that can be used to evaluate the successful achievement of both the Project and overall watershed goals? 3. Does the Proposal contain a discussion on post construction/initial implementation performance monitoring and does it appear to be reasonable? 4. Does the Proposal specify the methods that will be used to determine the pollutant load reductions and do they appear to be reasonable? 5. Does the Proposal quantify the predicted load reductions, and are the predicted load reductions reasonable? 6. Are the assessment and performance measures supported by adequate documentation? 7. How well does the Proposal describe how the Project effectiveness will be monitored and assessed (e.g., Project Performance Measures Table)? 	10
Full Proposal Evaluation Criteria – IMPLEMENTATION Project Maximum Score:	55

DRAFT: Under Management and Legal Review
Appendix I-2

Table 5: Full Proposal Grant-Specific Evaluation Criteria

Criteria	Maximum Score
PROGRAM SPECIFIC CRITERIA <i>The criteria are Program specific for evaluation and scoring of Proposals within a given Program. Each Proposal may receive up to 10 points based on its ability to meet the Program Specific Criteria outlined below.</i>	
A. Nonpoint Source (NPS) Implementation Program (Clean Water Act [CWA], Section 319[h] Program), Coastal NPS Pollution Control Program, & NPS Pollution Control Program <i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant demonstrates that the Proposal meets the specific NPS Program criteria.</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Does the Proposal identify appropriate management measures and management practices? Does the Proposal include partners in place to implement the Project as described in the Proposal? Does the Project implement activities within a watershed that is likely to achieve implementation of actions necessary to restore an impaired water body and/or compliance with water quality objectives by 2008? Does the Project enhance comprehensive community-based watershed efforts? Does the Project leverage other funding sources, especially Farm Bill funding (e.g., EQIP), to accomplish more extensive implementation with measurable environmental results? Does the Project integrate CWA, Section 319 and Farm Bill (e.g., EQIP) funding through coordination between State conservationists and local conservation districts? Does the Project provide for tracking the extent of management measure implementation that will help the State determine progress toward the goal of implementing management measures by 2013? Does the Project utilize innovative approaches that will serve as demonstrations for future implementation? Does the Project include activities such as technical transfer and outreach to promote ongoing implementation beyond the current Project area? Does the Project include monitoring within the watershed and/or with statewide water quality assessment? Is the Project part of a watershed-based plan for a waterbody with a completed Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL)? Will the Project achieve broad implementation that will achieve significant water quality results? 	10
B. Urban Stormwater Program <i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant demonstrates that the Proposal meets the specific Urban Stormwater Program criteria.</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the Project designed to reuse, detain, filter, or recharge stormwater onsite to minimize sediment and pollutant transport downstream? Does the Project reduce the combined sewer overflows in existing urban areas? Does the Project aim to increase, maintain, or restore riparian function or wetland areas? Does the Proposal integrate low-impact development (LID) techniques into site design such as detention and infiltration ponds, or flow attenuation devices to help reduce the impact of development and maintain pre-developed hydrologic conditions? Is the Project designed to decrease the concentration of a constituent(s) measured at the Project site before and after water flows through natural filtering devices (e.g., grassy swales, grassy filter strips, tree box filters, etc.)? 	10

DRAFT: Under Management and Legal Review
Appendix I-2

Table 5: Full Proposal Grant-Specific Evaluation Criteria

Criteria	Maximum Score
<p>C. Agricultural Water Quality Grant Program (AWQGP) <i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant demonstrates that the Proposal meets the specific Agricultural Water Quality Grant Program criteria.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How well does the Project assist in the implementation of a total maximum daily load (TMDL) that is established or under development? 2. How well will the Project contribute to the long-term attainment and maintenance of water quality standards? 3. How well are the Project implementation strategies and solutions coordinated with existing watershed management efforts to implement a regional, watershed-based approach? 4. How well does the Project use established management measures in achieving its goals and objectives? 5. How well does the Project (including tasks funded by non-AWQGP sources) propose to meet its goals, objectives, and outcomes without relying on future phases of funding? 	10
<p>D. Integrated Watershed Management Program <i>Scoring will be based on whether the applicant demonstrates that the Proposal meets the specific Integrated Watershed Management Program criteria.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How well does the local watershed management plan associated with the Proposal define the geographical boundaries of the watershed including the natural resource conditions in the watershed? 2. How well does the Proposal quantify the multiple benefits to be achieved by implementation of the Project? 3. How well does the Proposal demonstrate substantive partnerships among a diverse group of active stakeholders and show diverse involvement in determining needs, methods, and outcomes of the Project? 4. How well does the Project implement one or more of the watershed protection and water management Projects listed in the Summary Table of 2005-06 Consolidated Grants Program (Appendix A of the Guidelines)? 5. How well does the Proposal meet and integrate multiple partner agency priorities? (See Appendix G for a list of California Water Boards and partner agency priorities.) 6. How well does the Proposal explain how the Project is interrelated and works to enhance, preserve, and/or improve the watershed? 7. If the Proposal includes more than one Project, are the linkages or interdependence between the Projects clearly identified? 	10

DRAFT: Under Management and Legal Review
Appendix I-2

Table 6: Full Proposal Additional Information/General Program Questions

Criteria	Response/ Comments
<i>The Selection Panel will review the responses to the following questions as part of review of the consensus scores.</i>	
1. Has the Applicant been responsive to the Concept Proposal reviewers' comments? Explain your response in the text box provided.	
2. Does the Proposal address compliance with all applicable environmental review requirements? Does the reviewer have any concerns regarding environmental compliance requirements for the proposed Project?	
3. Are there modifications/enhancements that should be required for this Proposal as part of the grant agreement if the Project is selected for funding? If yes, explain.	
4. Does this Project satisfy, in part or in full, the requirements of any State Water Board or Regional Water Board regulation, permit, or order?	Response taken from Application.
5. Is the proposed completion time reasonable?	
6. Does the reviewer believe the proposed Project is technically and financially feasible?	
7. Does the reviewer believe that the same results could be accomplished at a lower total Project cost?	
8. Do you have any concerns about the applicant's ability to secure all of the required funding for accomplishing the expected outcomes of this Proposal?	
9. Is the Applicant or was the Applicant a party to current or pending litigation concerning any State Water Board or Regional Water Board regulation, permit, or order?	Response taken from Application.
10. Would you recommend the proposed Project for funding? Answer Yes or No. Explain your answer.	
11. Does the reviewer have any concerns about funding this Project? If you answered yes, please explain.	